UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,773	02/12/2007	Hans J. Stauss	28646/42100	7037
	7590 06/16/201 GERSTEIN & BORUN	EXAMINER		
233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE			SKELDING, ZACHARY S	
6300 WILLIS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606-6357			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1644	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/16/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/581,773	STAUSS ET AL.
Examiner initiated interview duminary	Examiner	Art Unit
	ZACHARY SKELDING	1644
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) ZACHARY SKELDING.	(3)	
(2) <u>Lynn Janulis</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>14 June 2010</u>	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa 	ne examiner will provide a written record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/Zachary Skelding/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1644	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Called applicant's representative Ms. Rin-Laures around June 3, 2010. Presented Ms. Rin-Laures with amendments that could be made by applicant to limit the claimed invention to allowable subject matter thereby obviating the need for future Office Actions/prosecution. Ms. Rin-Laures indicated that she would present this information to applicant and get back to me. Subsequent to this phone call Ms. Janulis called to indicate that applicant had been presented with this information but would prefer to continue prosecution at this time.